

Submission to Ipart re MidCoast council application for a Special Rate variation - Increase in rates

- Regarding a history of well-documented council productivity improvements
 - Council has failed to show this. Indeed it would be difficult considering the fact that the Council has only existed for a very short time. Previous councils have not shown a history of well-documented council productivity improvements.
 - On requesting information to allow a comparison of councils productivity against other councils and other published measures, council has declined to provide information. See requests made to council on their facebook page and the responses, at <http://ourmidcoastcouncil.weebly.com/on-line-petition-srv.html>, in relation to budgets per kilometre per annum. This indicates a NON history of council productivity improvements
 - On requesting information to allow a review of councils planning and designing for maintenance and rehabilitation activities , council has declined to provide information. See requests made to council on their facebook page and the responses, at <http://ourmidcoastcouncil.weebly.com/on-line-petition-srv.html> , in relation to planning and quality assurance. This indicates a NON history of council productivity improvements.
 - See comments from signatories to on line petition indicating councils poor history of productivity improvements. (Comments attached to this submission
- Regarding a reasonable impact on ratepayers.
 - See comments from signatories to on line petition indicating councils consideration of a reasonable impact on ratepayers. Council have not considered, or demonstrated a consideration of the impact when the impact is added to other price increases such as gas, electricity, Internet, water and sewage etc, with low to nil wage growth.
- Regarding a demonstrated need for higher increases to charges.
 - Council have not demonstrated that a so called underfunding of depreciation, is
 - Real, (the information that is used to make this statement is a very short report from consultants, with no methodology described, no real sensitivity analysis, no comprehensive comment on the base information. The information in previous councils asset management strategies and plans is poor or non existent. For example, what is the real value of the assets that drives depreciation schedules?)
 - A basis for increased charges via rates, where all other alternatives have been considered. No other alternatives, such as savings, increased productivity etc have been analysed or presented to the community. An example of what could be done is at <http://ourmidcoastcouncil.weebly.com/on-line-petition-srv.html>
- Regarding community awareness of their plans, and how effective each council's community inclusion has been before determining its application to increase charges above the set rate..
 - Community inclusion is almost zero. Council have not been effective at all in community inclusion. See the signatories and comments regarding objections to a SRV on an on line petition which with no advertising, or budget has in less than 5

weeks had more responses than any of this councils and previous councils previous three years of activities.

- The council has deliberately minimised any community engagement activities regarding a SRV since the notices and articles in the local press in late 2016 saying council was not applying for a SRV. This has extended to taking down web pages on the SRV on councils website during the exhibition period, minimal notice of required council meetings regarding the SRV and non consideration of community views during the period of exhibition, as demonstrated by reading prepared statements, which did not consider spoken submissions at meetings, and having a statement published within hours of closing of exhibition, which did not address the 300 submissions made during the exhibition period, where the on line petition alone made over 260 submissions.
- An online petition which has been presented to Council and Ipart during the last 4 weeks has over 460 signatories. (When considered in the context that only 15% of these sorts of online petitions gain more than 50 followers, this is a significant number of people who object to an increase in rates through an SRV). Please see the two attached documents, one of which contains the signatories, and the other which contains the comments)